

REMARKS

In the November 16, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-6, 14-19, 25-31 and 37-53 were pending in the application; and rejected all of the claims under the first and second paragraphs of 35 USC § 112. Claim 54 has been added. Thus, claims 1-6, 14-19, 25-31 and 37-54 remain in the case. The rejections are traversed below.

The reason given for the rejection under the second paragraphs of 35 USC § 112 was "insufficient antecedent basis for ... [the] limitation" (Office Action page 3, last line 4) recited on lines 14-16 of claim 1 and the similar limitations recited in the other independent claims. Based on the oral explanation obtained after issuance of the September 22, 2005 Office Action, it has been assumed that the alleged lack of "antecedent basis" is not in the claims, as usual in rejections under the second paragraphs of 35 USC § 112, but rather was a result of interpreting the claims to be inconsistent with the specification.

The independent claims have been amended in an effort to prevent interpreting the claims to be inconsistent with the specification. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to delete the phrase quoted at page 3, lines 1-3 of the November 16, 2006 Office Action. Additional amendments have been made to claim 1 to revise the remaining limitations in light of this deletion. Also, words have been added to claim 1 to indicate the timing that was believed to be implicit in claim 1 when interpreted in light of the specification, but the Examiner apparently did not agree, given the rejections under 35 USC § 112.

In the example described on pages 28 and 29 of the application, "when a user inputs an instruction to ... store the image displayed on the display device ... the magnification ratio ... and ... the display position ... [are stored] in ... the image information storing section" (page 28, lines 15-26). Furthermore, "[w]hen the image, which is stored in the image information storing section 5a, is displayed on the display device 11, the display control section 7 obtains the display information from the image information storing section" (page 28, last line to page 29, line 4). In other words, as previously recited in the claims, there are two different conditions in which an image may be displayed, depending on "whether said part of the original image is stored in said first storing section when said part of the original image is to be displayed on said display screen" (claim 1 in the Response filed September 15, 2006, lines 14-16). The amendments to claim 1 clarify the conditions which determine "whether said part of the original image is stored in said first storing section" by reciting "displaying said part of the original image ... **after** obtaining, if **previously** stored, the display position information and the image magnification ratio" (claim 1, lines 15-19). Similar changes have been made to claims 3, 46, 48, 49 and 51.

As amended, claims 43, 45, 52 and 53 recite "displaying said image at the image magnification ratio on said display screen" (e.g., claim 43, line 8) prior to "retaining the image magnification ratio and the display position information on the location of said image on the display screen as associated with said image" (e.g., claim 43, lines 11-12), "obtaining, **after** said retaining, the display position information" (e.g., claim 43, line 17, emphasis added) and "**subsequently** displaying said image at the location indicated by the display position information and at the image magnification ratio on said display screen" (e.g., claim 43, last 2 lines, emphasis added) to recite that the latter displaying operation is performed differently than the earlier displaying operation. As a result of these amendments, hopefully the Examiner will not interpret the claims in a manner inconsistent with the specification and will withdraw the rejections under 35 USC § 112.

New Claim 54

Claim 54 has been added to recite further details of how the display position information and the image magnification ratio are stored in the (first) storing section by the display information writing section as described, for example, on pages 19 and 28.

Request for Examiner Interview

The November 16, 2006 Office Action is the second Office Action that rejected the claims under one or both of the first and second paragraphs of 35 USC § 112 for lack of support in the specification. In making these rejections the Examiner appears to be interpreting the claims in a manner differently than intended. If the amendments and remarks above do not result in withdrawal of the rejections under the first and second paragraphs of 35 USC § 112, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone to arrange an interview prior to issuance of the next Office Action, so that the undersigned can determine what language will not be interpreted as inconsistent with the specification and further amendments can be made to use such language, so that a proper examination of the claims can be obtained.

Summary

It is submitted that the meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraph and therefore are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 16, 2007

By: *Richard A. Gollhofer*

Richard A. Gollhofer

Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005

Telephone: (202) 434-1500

Facsimile: (202) 434-1501